

#5  
S. Sand

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/220,910

Applicant(s)

Walsh

Examiner

Thong Vu

Group Art Unit

2152

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thong Vu

(3) Mark Rinehart

(2) David Schaffer, #43089

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview 3/27/02

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ Applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

Agenda via FAX received 3/11/02

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 2-15, 17-21, 23-30

Identification of prior art discussed:

Krause and Narasimhan of record

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) N/A


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed operation of an embodiment of the invention to provide e-mail document preparation function to heuristically identify and locate a file using a file descriptor without any specific file location information from information in the email document and retrieve the file for attachment into an encapsulated email document for transmission to a recipient.  
Discussed claim term "attaching" with regard to applied art and operation of a web browser to parse embedded URL file locators to retrieve and present a file element within (i.e., attached) a displayed HTML document. Applicant will consider amendment to claim language to clarify operation of invention in a document preparation environment and heuristic method of file location. Such amendment would overcome the art applied in the rejection but presents new issues for search and consideration to determine patentability.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MARK H. RINEHART  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.